6

11 12

13 14

15

17

18

24

28

FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mar 03, 2022

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

PATRICK FLEETWOOD and MICHAEL 10 FLEETWOOD,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY,

Defendant.

No. 2:20-CV-00355-SAB

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO **EXCLUDE** 

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude, ECF No. 41. Plaintiffs are 16 represented by Matthew Crotty. Defendant is represented by Debra Lefing and Brian Baker. The motion was considered without oral argument.

Plaintiffs request that the Court exclude the Declaration of Dan B. Patterson, ECF No. 36, which Defendant submitted in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 32. Plaintiffs state that Defendant did not disclose Mr. Patterson as a witness as part of its Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a) initial disclosures. Thus, Plaintiffs argue that the Court should exclude Mr. Patterson's Declaration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1).

Defendant in response argues that the Court should deny Plaintiffs' motion. Defendant states that Mr. Patterson is merely a custodian of records whose testimony is intended to attest to the authenticity and completeness of the records. Additionally, Defendant states that there is no surprise or prejudice from the

## ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXCLUDE # 1

6

8 9

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

nondisclosure of Mr. Patterson because the records Mr. Patterson attested to in his Declaration were ones that *Plaintiffs* provided to Defendant during discovery.

The Court is inclined to deny Plaintiffs' motion. However, the Court sets a 4 hearing with the parties to discuss whether Plaintiffs would like to depose Mr. Patterson before the Court proceeds on Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. The Court sets a hearing with the parties on March 8, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. by videoconference. Case participants will be provided with separate call-in details by email from the Court's staff.
- At the hearing, the parties should be prepared to discuss (1) whether Plaintiffs want an opportunity to depose Mr. Patterson before the Court rules on Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment; and (2) if so, what the proposed briefing schedule would be for ruling on Defendant's motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Clerk is directed to enter this Order and provide copies to counsel.

**DATED** this 3rd day of March 2022.



Stanley A. Bastian Chief United States District Judge